

## **UI PERFORMS**

### **BENEFITS TIMELINESS AND QUALITY MEASURES (BTQ)**

#### **Implementation**

- ▶ 1996
  - ▶ New Measures announced (UIPL 10-96).
  - ▶ Reports handbooks changes issued (ETA Handbook 401, Change 7 & 9; ETA Handbook 402, Change 2). Appeals and nonmonetary adjudication quality review handbooks issued.
  - ▶ States began to create universes for lower authority appeals & nonmonetary determinations (July 1996). Sampling instructions issued. (UIPL 35-96).
  - ▶ Q&As issued (UIPL 33-96).
  - ▶ Quality review implementation sessions (3) held for States.
  - ▶ First quarterly quality reviews conducted (October 1996).
- ▶ 1997
  - ▶ States began to collect data for monthly promptness measures (January 1997)
  - ▶ Consolidated Q&A issued (UIPL 10-97).
  - ▶ National appeals quality rereview conducted.
  - ▶ RO BTQ meeting held.
  - ▶ Eight follow up nonmon quality review implementation/training sessions held.
  - ▶ Handbook 301 (Nonmonetary Adjudication, (QPI)) revised (for clarification and simplification). To be issued February, 1998.
  - ▶ 1st annual BTQ report in preparation. Format similar to BAM report to be supportive of continuous improvement.

#### **Remaining Issues/Actions & Next Steps**

- ▶ Reporting Issues. Several States continue to have problems reporting BTQ data. States explained in their Program and Budget plans the steps they are taking to correct reporting problems and their plans for speedy resolution. Will closely track State corrective action plans until problems resolved.
- ▶ Revision of BPC measures (See BPC).
- ▶ Development and implementation of a Higher Authority Appeals Quality measure.
- ▶ Software Issues.
  - ▶ Supporting software for National Appeals Quality Rereview under development. Expected early CY 1998.
  - ▶ Initial BTQ software slow and cumbersome. Revised specifications under development.
  - ▶ Development of automated means by which to sort and display data for reports.
  - ▶ Means for inputting Virgin Islands quality review results still unresolved.

## **UI PERFORMS**

### **BENEFIT ACCURACY MEASUREMENT (BAM)**

**Program Changes.** Comment solicited on BAM changes via UIPL 15-96, April 2, 1996.

- ▶ **Reduction in Required Sample Sizes.** Sample sizes were reduced from an average of 810 per State annually and a range of 480 to 1800, to 360 in the ten smallest States and 480 in all others. Changes announced via UIPL 03-97 (November 2, 1996); changes made in ET Handbook No. 395, 2nd Edition, Change 5 (January 2, 1997).
- ▶ **Flexibility in Data Verification.** States now have the option to verify all claims information by phone, or mail, or by fax, or in person. Changes announced via UIPL 03-97 (November 2, 1996); changes made in ET Handbook No. 395, 2nd Edition, Change 5 (January 2, 1997).
- ▶ **Data Release.** The States no longer have to release overpayment and underpayment rates in a public forum. UIPL 27-96 (3/20/96), FM No. 27-96, (3/20/96)
- ▶ **Building Blocks Rates.** Data reported in more elaborate breakdowns of accuracy to help users see the effect of different State laws and policies on overpayment and underpayment rates. Two alternative building block schemes were used in the CY 1995 and CY 1996 BAM Annual Reports.
- ▶ **Staffing.** Resources freed up by the reductions in measurement effort have remained available to the SESAs to pursue the goals of UI PERFORMS overall with an emphasis on continuous improvement. The formulation and allocation of resources is done under UI PERFORMS umbrella category. UIPL 27-96 (3/20/96), FM No. 27-96, (3/20/96)

#### **Regional Office Monitoring Changes:**

- ▶ **Case Review.** ROs review minimum of 40 cases per year in each State: 20 per quarter in two non-consecutive quarters or ten each quarter. There must be one onsite visit. ET Handbook 396, 3rd. Edition, Change 1, Chapter V (June 20, 1997)
- ▶ **Methods and Procedures Review.** Review Organization and Authority by exception only. Forms and Written Procedures required every other year. FM No. 59-95 (8/7/95)
- ▶ **Quarterly Reports.** Now required only semi annually. (8/7/95)
- ▶ **QC-9.** Preparation with the Annual Determination Letter is optional. FM No. 59-95 (8/7/95)

## **Remaining Issues/Actions & Next Steps**

- ▶ Denied Claim Accuracy operational pilots underway . Nationwide implementation January 2000.
- ▶ Review of the existing Paid Claim data record (DCI) to reduce its size. To be done in conjunction with DCI review and any revision necessary prior to implementation of Denied Claim Accuracy.
- ▶ Expand Paid Claim accuracy sample universe specifications to include interstate claims.
- ▶ Conduct research to determine if work search verification is best method of ensuring active search for work.

February 10, 1998  
s:\ui\dpr\dotpoint\uiperf.bam

## **UI PERFORMS**

### **DENIED CLAIM ACCURACY ( a.k.a. DENIALS)**

#### **Development Activities**

- ▶PRAMM, Inc., selected as technical support/evaluation contractor.
- ▶Pilot States selected (NJ, NE, SC, WI, WV) and cooperative agreements signed 9/30/96.
- ▶Meeting held with 4 State pilot representatives (all but NJ), Regional, contractor staff to refine pilot design, October 1996.
  - ▶OMB clearance for pilot received May 1, 1997.
- ▶Mainframe programming (COBOL program to assemble denials universe, select sample cases, download key elements on sampled cases to Sun computer) completed by SC and WI, May 1997.
- ▶Detailed definitions and specifications for Pilot database record (Data Collection Instrument, or DCI) delivered to States, May 1997.
- ▶Sun software for modules needed to begin pilot were completed and sent to States in mid-August 1997; remaining modules will be available to States in November 1997.

#### **Remaining Issues/Actions & Next Steps**

##### **Pilot**

- ▶Sampling started week of September 8, 1997 and will run for 12 months.
  - All States are up and running with minimal problems.
- ▶Early-experience meeting of pilot reps, RO, NO, contract staff was held November 13-14, 1997 in Charleston, SC.
  - ▶Evaluation Report expected November 1998.

##### **Implementation**

- ▶Nationwide denied claim accuracy measurement to begin January 1, 2000.

# UI PERFORMS

## TAX PERFORMANCE MEASURES

### Development and Implementation

- ▶ 1988 -- Development began as Revenue Quality Control initiative
- ▶ 1990-1991 -- Pretested in 8 SESAs, 1990; pilot tested in 9 SESAs , 1991
- ▶ 1991-1992 -- Revisions to design
- ▶ 1993 -- 49 SESAs implement RQC voluntarily using "RQC Operating Manual", assisted by large-scale training efforts.
- ▶ 1995-1996 -- Two-phase nationwide implementation:
  - ▶ 1995 -- Phase One implementation: revised ET 581 data collection; software released allowing SESAs to calculate ET 581-based Computed Measures.
  - ▶ 1996 -- Phase Two implementation effective January: SESAs perform Systems Reviews and draw and evaluate Acceptance Samples, and collect data on Best Tax Practices; software to capture major portion of data is developed, tested and released to States.
- ▶ 1997
  - ▶ SESAs complete full evaluation of UI tax operation, produce annual report for CY 1996, submit hard copy to ROs.
  - ▶ Remaining software for data capture is released to all SESAs.
  - ▶ ROs begin to conduct Interstate Integrity Reviews, using out of State reviewers to examine host State tax operations.
  - ▶ SESA annual report data submitted by RO to NO and efforts are underway to compile data from Phases One and Two into a national report on UI tax performance.

### Remaining Issues/Actions & Next Steps:

- ▶ Proposed reclassification of Timeliness of Deposit of Contributions to a Tier II Measure; results of exploration of feasibility of developing a single measure combining timeliness of deposit to the CA and of transfer from the CA to the trust fund.
- ▶ Development of automated means by which ROs can capture selected "Best Practices" data. States can enter data into UI database, but ROs can not access, nor can they select specific portions of information.
- ▶ Development of automated means by which to sort and display data for UI PERFORMS reports.

- ▶ Development & implementation of new Tier II measure, Employer Tax Appeals Quality.

February 10, 1998  
S:\ui\dpr\dotpoint\uiperf.tps

## **UI PERFORMS**

### **BPC PROGRAM**

**Alternative measures** of performance for BPC. BPC measures were pulled out of PMR in 1992 with the thought that they would be returned to at a later date.

- ▶ Three SESAs, West Virginia, California, and Utah, have gathered and evaluated data for alternative measures.
- ▶ Recommendations for implementing new or revised measures in all SESAs in FY 1998.

### **Technical Assistance Projects**

**Overpayment Recovery.** Cooperative agreement with California began in 1995 and will continue to September 1998.

- ▶ Project includes gathering information from SESAs, other government agencies, and the private sector on methods, techniques, and automation. This data and performance data will be analyzed and made available through the ITSC website.
- ▶ Project will provide training for SESA staff in Overpayment recovery (June 1998).
- ▶ Project will revise Handbook No. 375 (Resource Handbook on OP Recovery, issued 1978).

**Detection.** Cooperative Agreement with Utah .

- ▶ Exploring ways to enhance methods used to detect and investigate overpayments.
- ▶ Training packages will be provided for beginner and advanced investigators (Mid 1998).

**Third Party Fraud Project.** Cooperative agreement with Texas concluded September 30, 1997.

- ▶ The project was inspired by the Eagle Pass/Roma McAllen fraud schemes involving third parties who filed claims on behalf of claimants, certified to false work search contracts, forged claimants' signatures, and cashed UI checks. Most were

interstate claims.

- ▶ Texas investigated claims from three test offices where multiple claimants have been using same address. Where interstate, claims have been referred to agent State.

February 6, 2001  
s:\ui\dpr\dotpoint\uiperf.bpc

# **UI PERFORMS**

## **VALIDATION**

### **Workload Validation**

- ▶ Through Workload Validation (WV), UIS now validates 10 data items which are of key importance for budget determination and allocation and as economic measures.
- ▶ OMB authorization for WV expires September 30, 1997; OMB has been asked to extend WV's approval, using the updated handbook, to September 30, 2000 so that validation can continue until Data Validation is implemented.
- ▶ Existing validation support contract (with Fu Associates) expires 9/30/97; UIS is seeking to maintain validation support through FY 1998. At present, there are insufficient National Activities funds to continue such support beyond FY 1998.
- ▶ The WV handbook (Handbook 361) is being updated to reflect BTQ definition changes. A directive detailing FY 1998 validation requirements is in preparation.

### **Data Validation**

- ▶ As part of the PMR project, Mathematica Policy Research (MPR) developed a comprehensive, more sophisticated, highly automated approach to validating most benefit report elements and the 581 (tax) report. MPR developed and delivered on May 31, 1997 State-specific validation handbooks (53 tax and 52 benefits) to guide the process.
- ▶ Portions of the tax validation system were pretested in three States in 1996; part of the benefits validation system was pretested in one State in 1997.
- ▶ The complete benefit and tax validations will be pilot tested in two States in 1998: Minnesota and North Carolina. Massachusetts will pilot the benefits methodology in 1998.
- ▶ Contractor assistance was obtained to guide and evaluate the pilot test, develop training, and train Federal staff. Contractor assistance is also being used to reformat and update the handbooks to ensure that they are as user-friendly as possible and thus minimize TA requirements for implementation.

### **Remaining Issues/Actions & Next Steps**

- ▶ If all proceeds without problem and States make good process toward Year 2000 compliance, then a FY 1999 announcement would be made of planned implementation in 2000.
  - ▶ Conduct and evaluate pilot.
  - ▶ Develop data validation system specifications and transition from workload validation plan.



- ▶ Train Federal trainers.
- ▶ Implementation announcement and training of state staff.

February 10, 1998  
S:\ui\dpr\dotpoint\uiperf.val

## UI PERFORMS

### STATE QUALITY SERVICE PLAN (SQSP)

#### Program Budget Plan (PBP)

- ▶ Through the annual PBP, States provide budget planning information, operation and performance assurances, and corrective action plans (CAPs) to improve deficient performances measured by the current Secretary's Standards and Desired Levels of Achievement (DLAs).
- ▶ With the introduction of new performance measurements and/or definition change, requirement for CAPs related to new and/or changed measures (nonmonetary determinations, cash management, & tax performance measures) was suspended & the goal of continuous improvement instituted until new benchmarks are established.
- ▶ A 3-year extension of existing collection authority obtained to ensure continued collection authority until SQSP developed and implemented.

#### SQSP

- ▶ The PEWG recommended a plan for continuous performance improvement based on key performance objectives, perhaps separate from budget, but "related to budget plans."
  - ▶ A narrative to identify why improvement actions were planned for the upcoming cycle such as:
    - ▶ past performance below established criteria;
    - ▶ federal emphases during upcoming period;
    - ▶ state priorities; and
    - ▶ continuation of multi-year effort.
  - ▶ A quantitative section would cover the following:
    - ▶ Data on measures (showing national criteria and State planning targets);
    - ▶ Data from other measures related to actions planned or underway ;
    - ▶ Trust Fund solvency (State may use own measures/descriptors); and
    - ▶ Customer Service/Satisfaction (State may use own measures/descriptors).
  - ▶ The planning process would involve the regional offices and States would be encouraged, but not required, to seek stakeholder input.

- ▶ The SQSP would likely be annual with timing of the cycle the same as present PBP, although since most data are now available monthly or quarterly other options could be considered.
- ▶ Federal priorities would be developed as part of a parallel Federal performance plan which would be completed with enough lead time to be reflected in Federal SQSP guidance.

## **UI PERFORMS**

### **STATE QUALITY SERVICE PLAN (SQSP) CON'T.**

#### **Remaining Issues/Actions & Next Steps**

- ▶ Review ANPRM comments and other guidance with the reconvened PEG. Finalize system framework.
  - ▶ Regulation must reserve Secretary's Authority to take action concerning "deficient performance" relative to Tier II measures. Do we want to change the SQSP construct due to this -- e.g., performance minimums negotiated (required vs optional) for Tier II measures as part of the SQSP to provide a definition for "deficient" which each State establishes or leave as is?
- ▶ Develop proposed system specifications based on PEG consultation, e.g., size, timing, formats, etc.
- ▶ Publish Federal Register Notice.
- ▶ Obtain OMB Approval for SQSP.
- ▶ Develop and establish reward and recognition systems.
- ▶ Develop plan to assure Federal technical competencies.
- ▶ Develop system for compiling and distributing inventory of technical competencies within system.
- ▶ Establish clearinghouse facility for technical information.
- ▶ Identify requirements for and establish system for development of materials needed to support RO participation in Tier II negotiations.
- ▶ Develop and establish CAP tracking system.

## UI PERFORMS

### CRITERIA SETTING

#### Background

- ▶ Performance benchmarks or criteria are levels specified along a measurement scale to differentiate desired from undesirable performance.
- ▶ The PEWG recommended establishing national benchmarks or criteria (defined as performance floors States were expected to exceed) for ten key "Tier I" measures. Annual performance targets for Tier I and other measures would be negotiated individually with States during the planning process (but setting such performance targets is optional not mandatory) .
- ▶ In 1996, UI used the following benchmarks:
  - ▶ Six criteria implementing Secretary's Standards for timeliness of first payments and lower-authority appeals.
  - ▶ 20 criteria giving Desired Levels of Achievement (DLAs) in various benefit payment, benefit payment control, and tax performance areas.
- ▶ With the introduction of new performance measures and/or definition change, requirement for corrective action plans related to new performance measures and/or definition change (nonmonetary determinations, cash management, and tax performance measures) was suspended and the goal of continuous improvement instituted until new benchmarks are established.

#### Remaining Issues/Actions & Next Steps

- ▶ Establishment of new benchmarks (minimum performance floors) for existing measures .
  - ▶ Final decisions on measures (Tier I/Tier II) must be made.
    - ▶ Reclassification of Timeliness of Deposit of Contributions (from Tier I to Tier II) has been proposed.
    - ▶ ETA lawyers advise that regulation must reserve Secretary's Authority to take action concerning

"deficient performance" relative to Tier II measures. Do we want to change the SQSPconstruct due to this -- e.g., performance minimums negotiated (required vs optional) for Tier II measures as part of the SQSP process to provide a definition for "deficient" in the creation of which the State has role or leave as is?

- ▶ Establish criteria for key measures.
  - ▶ Establish Federal/State workgroups (Benefits, Appeals, & Tax/Cash Management) to analyze historical data and propose criteria.
  - ▶ Review workgroup proposals with PEG ( Summer 98)
  - ▶ Issue Federal Register Notice to initiate system dialogue
  - ▶ UI Director's Meeting Workshop (12/98) to continue dialogue
  - ▶ Review comments received and finalize criteria.
- ▶ Establish schedule and process for ongoing periodic review and revision of benchmarks.
- ▶ Benchmarks may need to be developed related to one or more of the additional measures envisioned.

February 10, 1998  
s:\ui\dpr\dotpoint\uiperf.crt

# UI PERFORMS

## UI REGULATION

- ▶ The PEWG recommended three stage development (ANPRM, NPRM, FRM) of a simplified UI PERFORMS regulation that would embrace existing BQC, 1st pay and appeals timeliness regs.
- ▶ Regulations, at minimum, must identify:
  - ▶ DOL authority
  - ▶ what States can be required to do
  - ▶ what types of standards States are expected to meet (but not specific measures or criterion)
  - ▶ what kinds of actions DOL can take
  - ▶ what kinds of procedures will be followed.

### Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM)

- ▶ The ANPRM for the UI PERFORMS regulation was published in the Federal Register on January 16, 1997 for 60-day comment.
  - ▶ It identified framework principles to be used in drafting the regulation, i.e., the reg would:
    - ▶ identify the basic elements of UI PERFORMS system;
    - ▶ be brief and generic; specifications for performance measures, benchmarks, etc., would be contained in program letters not in the regulation;
    - ▶ include a broader array of performance incentives/penalties than current regulations (i.e., withdrawal of entire FUTA credit or UI administrative funding); and
    - ▶ identify consistent, swift action to be taken to address performance deficiencies .
  - ▶ It sought suggestions for the broader array of incentives/penalties.
- ▶ As of 3/26/97, responses received from 16 SESAs, one RO, and an ICESA-sponsored group. In all, 22 States were represented.
  - ▶ Ten responses clearly positive; 4 (all States) clearly negative.
  - ▶ Main recurring themes:
    - ▶ UI administrative funding is inadequate;
    - ▶ There is unhappiness with the new BTQ measures;
    - ▶ Develop/roll out UI PERFORMS jointly, in partnership; and
    - ▶ UI PERFORMS changes may be more extensive than needed.

### Remaining Issues/Actions & Next Steps

- ▶ Review any ANPRM comments not addressed during SQSP system

affirmation discussion with the reconvened PEG.

- ▶ Finalize plate of rewards and sanctions.
- ▶ Develop Notice of Proposed Rule -- target issuance Fall 1998.
- ▶ Review comments on NPRM; develop and publish Final Rule.

February 10, 1998  
s:\ui\dpr\dotpoint\uiperf.reg

# **UI PERFORMS**

## **REPORTS & ANALYSIS**

### **Background**

- ▶ Through 1996, UIS issued two annual performance reports: Quality Appraisal (QA) and Benefit Quality Control (now Benefit Accuracy Measurement).
- ▶ PEWEG recommended a single UI PERFORMS overview report, organized State-by-State so as to support continuous improvement and not to rank States explicitly by performance.

### **Ongoing**

- ▶ In 1997, UIS is pursuing the following reporting strategy:
  - ▶ BAM report as for previous 8 years (released August 1997);
  - ▶ BTQ report, displaying the new measures and showing transition from QA measures (target: late 1997); and
  - ▶ TPS report, displaying the new measures and showing transition from QA measures (target: late 1997).
- ▶ Data analysis segment included in BTQ Follow up sessions to encourage and facilitate State data analysis.
- ▶ Interim RO data access addressed. Data analysis segment included in RO BTQ session to encourage and facilitate RO data analysis.

### **Remaining Issues/Actions & Next Steps**

- ▶ Several States continue to have reporting problems. Corrective actions included in 1998 PBP.
- ▶ Circulate for comment, via UIPL and Federal Register notice, a proposed UI PERFORMS report, which will be issued for the first time in 1998 (Target: Spring 1998).
- ▶ First quarterly report on the status of the UI system for ETA managers issued February 1998. Similar reports on key performance indicators for UI Regional Directors and ETA Regional Administrators under development.
- ▶ Develop summary of data analysis issuances.
- ▶ Development of automated means by which to RO's can capture selected TPS "Best Practices" data. Software expected late in CY 1998. Also need automated means to sort and display data for UI PERFORMS reports.
- ▶ Also under development is a strategy to facilitate the regular analysis of performance data, including training in accessing and using UIDB data and the development and installation of report

software that can be used to extract data from the UI database (UIDB) and display it in report formats.

February 10, 1998  
s:\ui\dpr\dotpoint\uiperf.r&a

## **UI PERFORMS**

### **Remaining Issues/Actions & Next Steps**

#### **Measurement Systems**

##### **Benefits Timeliness & Quality**

- ▶ Reporting Issues. Several States continue to have problems reporting BTQ data. States explained in their Program and Budget plans the steps they are taking to correct reporting problems and their plans for speedy resolution. Will closely track State corrective action plans until problems resolved.
- ▶ Revision of BPC measures.
  - ▶ BPC measures pulled out of PMR in 1992 with intention to return to at a later date.
  - ▶ Three SESAs, West Virginia, California, and Utah, have gathered and evaluated data for alternative measures.
  - ▶ Results currently being analyzed & recommendations formulated for decision-making.
  - ▶ Implementation of new measures.
- ▶ Development and implementation of a Higher Authority Appeals Quality measure.
- ▶ Software Issues.
  - ▶ Supporting software for National Appeals Quality Rereview under development. Expected early CY 1998.
  - ▶ Initial BTQ software slow and cumbersome. Revised specifications under development.
  - ▶ Development of automated means by which to sort and display data for reports.
  - ▶ Means for inputting Virgin Islands quality review results still unresolved.
- ▶ Reassessments. Several small States have requested lower appeals quality sample sizes and several States have questioned the cost effectiveness of quarterly reviews versus biannual or annual; committed to review these areas after 2-3 years of operation.

##### **Benefit Accuracy Measurement**

- ▶ Denied Claim Accuracy operational pilots underway .
  - ▶ Sampling started week of September 8, 1997 and will run for 12 months. All States are up and running with minimal problems.



- ▶ Early-experience meeting of pilot reps, RO, NO, contract staff was held November 13-14, 1997 in Charleston, SC.
- ▶ Evaluation Report expected November 1998.
- ▶ Nationwide denied claim accuracy measurement to begin January 1, 2000.
- ▶ Review of the existing Paid Claim data record (DCI) to reduce size. To be done in conjunction with DCI review and any revision necessary prior to implementation of Denied Claim Accuracy.
- ▶ Expand Paid Claim accuracy sample universe specifications to include interstate claims.
- ▶ Conduct research to determine if work search verification is best method of ensuring active search for work.

#### **Tax Performance System**

- ▶ Proposed reclassification of Timeliness of Deposit of Contributions to a Tier II Measure; results of exploration of feasibility of developing a single measure combining timeliness of deposit to the Clearing Account (CA) and of transfer from the CA to the trust fund.
- ▶ Development of automated means by which ROs can capture selected "Best Practices" data. States can enter data into UI database, but ROs can not access, nor can they select specific portions of information.
- ▶ Development of automated means by which to sort and display data for UI PERFORMS reports.
- ▶ Development & implementation of new Tier II measure, Employer Tax Appeals Quality.

#### **GPRA Strategic Planning/Performance Goals & Measures**

- ▶ Impact of GPRA and the establishment of "Strategic Goals" and annual "Performance Goals & Measures" as part of the Strategic Plan process on UI PERFORMS identified and appropriate adjustments implemented.

#### **One-Stop System Performance Measures**

- ▶ Impact of One-Stop System Performance measures currently under development identified and appropriate adjustments implemented.

#### **Customer Service/Satisfaction**

- ▶ Distribution of results of a national survey of customer (claimant) satisfaction.
- ▶ A Customer Service/Satisfaction measure under ETA wide development as part of One-Stop Performance Measurement effort. Impact on UI PERFORMS identified and appropriate adjustments implemented.

## **Data Validation**

- ▶ Conduct and evaluate pilot.
- ▶ Develop data validation system specifications and transition from workload validation plan.
- ▶ Train Federal trainers.
- ▶ Implementation announcement and training of state staff.

## **State Quality Service Plan System**

- ▶ Review ANPRM comments and other guidance with the reconvened PEG. Finalize system framework.
- ▶ Develop proposed system specifications after consultation with the reconvened PEG, e.g., size, timing, formats, etc..
- ▶ Publish Federal Register Notice detailing SQSP system.
- ▶ Obtain OMB Approval for SQSP.
- ▶ Develop and establish reward and recognition systems.
- ▶ Develop plan to assure Federal technical competencies.
- ▶ Develop system for compiling and distributing inventory of technical competencies within system.
- ▶ Establish clearinghouse facility for technical information.
- ▶ Identify requirements for and establish system for development of materials needed to support RO participation in Tier II negotiations.
- ▶ Develop and establish CAP tracking system.

## **Regulation**

- ▶ Review any ANPRM comments not addressed during SQSP system affirmation discussion with the reconvened PEG.
- ▶ Finalize plate of rewards and sanctions.
- ▶ Develop Notice of Proposed Rule -- target issuance Fall 1998.
- ▶ Review comments on NPRM; develop and publish Final Rule.

## **Criterion Setting**

- ▶ Establishment of new benchmarks (minimum performance floors) for existing measures .
  - ▶ Final decisions on measures (Tier I/Tier II) must be made.
    - ▶ Reclassification of Timeliness of Deposit of Contributions (from Tier I to Tier II) has been proposed.
    - ▶ Regulations must reserve Secretary's Authority to take action concerning "deficient performance" relative to Tier II measures. Do we want to change the SQSP construct due to this or leave as is?
  - ▶ Decision on process must be made. It will likely involve

cooperative NO, RO, State effort to set criteria for key measures.

- ▶ Some measures have just been implemented and experience with them is limited.
  - ▶ Data validation will not begin until January 2000 at the earliest.
- ▶ Establish schedule and process for ongoing periodic review and revision of benchmarks.
  - ▶ Benchmarks may need to be developed related to one or more of the additional measures envisioned.

## **Reports & Analysis**

- ▶ Several States continue to have reporting problems. Corrective actions included in 1998 PBP.
- ▶ Circulate for comment, via UIPL and Federal Register notice, a proposed UI PERFORMS report, which will be issued for the first time in 1998 (Target: late 1997).
- ▶ Under development are periodic reports on the status of the UI system for ETA managers, and similar reports on key performance indicators for UI Regional Directors and ETA Regional Administrators.
- ▶ Also under development is a strategy to facilitate the regular analysis of performance data, including training in accessing and using UIDB data and the development and installation of report software that can be used to extract data from the UI database (UIDB) and display it in report formats.
- ▶ Common understanding concerning their desirability and use of ranking tables for such reports needs to be reached.
- ▶ Development of automated means by which to RO's can capture selected TPS "Best Practices" data. Software expected late in CY 1998.
- ▶ Development of automated means by which to sort and display data for UI PERFORMS reports.